

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15 and 17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are amended, and claims 8, 14 and 16 are canceled. No new matter is added. In view of at least the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Boddie at the interview held June 7, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,493 to Enami et al. ("Enami") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,079,130 to LeChevalier ("130 LeChevalier"); claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,134 to Plus et al. ("Plus"); claims 8, 12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami and '130 LeChevalier in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,050,024 to LeChavalier ("024 LeChevalier"); claims 9, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under Enami and '130 LeChevalier in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,861,810 to Rutherford; claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami and Plus in further view of '024 LeChavalier; and claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami and Plus in further view of '024 LeChevalier. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Brief telephone conversations with the Examiner confirmed that '130 LeChevalier is applied instead of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,606. Additionally, Applicants clarified that claims 9, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected over Enami, '130 LeChevalier, and Rutherford.

The applied references do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because they fail to suggest, alone or in combination, an electro-optical device including data lines,

precharge supply lines connected to the data lines, and test lines, where "each of the test lines [is] shared with a corresponding precharge supply line," as recited in independent claim 1.

As discussed during the interview, the Examiner asserts that '024 LeChevalier discloses an electro-optical device where test lines are shared with precharge signal lines. See, also, Office Action at page 13. The Examiner specifically points to Fig. 8 of '024 LeChevalier and asserts that the right side of lines 274 are test lines, and the left side of 274 are precharge signal supply lines. See, Office Action at page 13.

'024 LeChevalier does not suggest that precharge lines may be shared with test lines because '024 LeChevalier uses separate lines to supply a precharge signal and to test the charge. Referring to Fig. 8, the alleged test line is connected to column connector 274 by switch 822 and 818. See, '024 LeChevalier at col. 18, lines 9-14. The precharge source is connected to the column connector 274 via switch 812. See, '024 LeChevalier at col. 17, lines 63-66. Accordingly, while '024 LeChevalier may suggest that both elements can be connected to the column connector 274, it does not disclose or suggest that the precharge signal and test signal share the same line, as recited in claim 1.

At most, '024 LeChevalier may suggest that current control circuit 294 and sample capacitor 820 may both be connected to a data line at column connector 274, which is illustrated more clearly in Fig. 2 of '024 LeChevalier. The Examiner appears to suggest that connector 274 constitutes a portion where the lines are shared. However, the use of a common data line via connector 274 does not describe sharing lines because the pending claims recite that the test lines and precharge lines are connected to a data line and are shared, i.e., the shared portion is separate from the data line. In this regard, compare Fig. 4 of the pending application with Fig. 8 of '024 LeChevalier. In the embodiment of the claimed subject matter illustrated in Fig. 4, the test/precharge lines are labeled TPLR, TPLG and TPLB and are connected to a corresponding data line, e.g., VRdata, VGdata, or VBdata. In

contrast, '024 LeChevalier describes separate test lines and precharge lines that may be connected to a data line at a similar connection region 274. Independent claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 recite similar features to those referred to in claim 1 above. Thus, for at least these reasons claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are patentable over the applied references.

Claims 4, 7, 9-13, 15 and 17 depend from one of independent claims 1-3, 5 or 6 and are therefore also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons enumerated above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7, 9-13, 15 and 17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Aaron L. Webb
Registration No. 56,930

JAO:ALW/hs

Date: July 3, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--